

93d CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
1st Session } No. 93-510

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ACT OF  
1973

SEPTEMBER 13, 1973.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the  
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs,  
submitted the following

REPORT

together with

OPPOSING, ADDITIONAL, AND MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany S. 1914]

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the bill S. 1914 to provide for the establishment of the Board for International Broadcasting, to authorize the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and for other purposes, having considered the same report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 1914 is to provide for the establishment of the Board for International Broadcasting, which would be authorized to receive congressionally appropriated funds, allocate same to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and to perform review functions.

The bill also authorizes an appropriation of \$50,209,000 for fiscal year 1974 to support the operations of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and the Board for International Broadcasting.

COMMITTEE ACTION

On May 18, 1973, the Executive forwarded to the Speaker of the House Executive Communication 948, together with a draft bill "to provide for the establishment of the Board for International Broadcasting to authorize the continuation of assistance to Radio Free

Europe and Radio Liberty and for other purposes." This draft was introduced as H.R. 8144 by the chairman of the committee on May 24, 1973.

The committee held hearings on H.R. 8144 on July 31 and August 1. It received testimony from Hon. Walter J. Stoessel Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, and members of a Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting whose recommendations formed the basis for the proposed legislation. Members of that Commission were as follows: Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Chairman, president emeritus, Johns Hopkins University; Hon. Edward W. Barrett, Director, Communications Institute, Academy for Educational Development (and former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs); Hon. John A. Gronouski, dean, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas and former Ambassador to Poland; Hon. Edmund A. Gullion, dean, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University and former Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo; and Hon. John P. Roche, Professor of Politics, Brandeis University, and newspaper columnist (and former consultant to President Johnson).

The committee also heard testimony from Mr. Ilvars J. Spilners, President of the American Latvian Association and designated representative of the Joint Baltic American Committee; Mr. Aloysius Mazewski, President of the Polish American Congress; and Messrs. William P. Durkee and Howland H. Sargeant, Presidents of RFE and RL, respectively.

Before the committee acted upon H.R. 8144, the Senate passed S. 1914. That bill is identical to the Executive draft (H.R. 8144) except for the following differences:

(1) The amount authorized for fiscal year 1974 is \$50,209,000 rather than \$50,300,000. The lower figure represents the amount actually budgeted by the Executive for the two radios and the Board for International Broadcasting;

(2) There is no authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1975; and

(3) The bill requires private contributions and contributors to the two radio stations to be made a matter of public record.

On September 11, 1973, the committee held an open markup session. By a vote of 22 to 6, the committee ordered favorably reported the bill S. 1914 without amendment.

#### COST ESTIMATES

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XIII of the House Rules, the committee has examined the request submitted by the Executive and has determined that an authorization of \$50,209,000 is sufficient to support the operations of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and the Board for International Broadcasting for fiscal year 1974. The administration's request for an open-ended authorization for fiscal year 1975 was disapproved.

As noted elsewhere in this report, approximately 80 percent of the radios' operating expenses are paid in foreign currencies. Hence, cost projections—even over a 6-month period—are drastically affected by fluctuations in the value of the dollar vis-a-vis other currencies, especially the deutsche mark. Consequently, the committee does not

believe a realistic cost projection past June 30, 1974, can be made at this time.

#### BACKGROUND

Radio Free Europe (RFE) and Radio Liberty (RL) had their inception in the years immediately following World War II, when the Soviets gave every indication of establishing hegemony over Eastern Europe and threatening Western interests. RFE was incorporated in New York in 1950 and RL in Delaware in 1951. Until June 30, 1971, both radios were supported by funds provided by the Central Intelligence Agency. In the case of RFE, small amounts were raised from private sources.

Since CIA funding has been denied both organizations by the Congress, they have been funded on an annual, temporary basis under section 703 of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended. This act (the Smith-Mundt Act) is the basic authority for the activities of the U.S. Information Agency. Under this authority, an authorization of \$35 million was provided to the Secretary of State for fiscal year 1972 and \$39.67 million for fiscal year 1973. Both of these authorizations were stop-gap measures, pending the completion of studies on RFE and RL—first by the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office—and more recently by a Presidential Study Commission, described below.

#### EISENHOWER COMMISSION REPORT

The Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting was established on August 9, 1972, and submitted its report to the President on February 5, 1973.

In its report, entitled "The Right to Know," the Commission unanimously concluded that the two radios continue to serve a useful purpose and are consistent with U.S. foreign policy objectives during an era of East-West détente.

As the report states:

The Commission is convinced that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, by providing a flow of free and uncensored information to peoples deprived of it, actually contribute to a climate of détente, rather than detract from it \* \* \*.

The Commission therefore recommended that the stations be continued for at least another decade or "until the governments of the countries to which the stations are broadcasting permit a free flow of information and ideas, both internally and between East and West."

As a mechanism for continued public funding of the two stations, the Commission recommended the creation by congressional action of a Board for International Broadcasting—a public institution which would receive appropriated funds for allocation to RFE and RL and which would serve as a "nexus between the public, Congress, the executive branch, and the stations." The Board's composition and functions, as defined in the proposed legislation, will be discussed in a subsequent section of this report.

#### RADIO FREE EUROPE (RFE)

RFE operates under the direction of Free Europe, Inc., a private, nonprofit organization incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, with administrative headquarters in New York City. Operational headquarters are in Munich from which it broadcasts daily—via transmitters in Germany and Portugal—about 20 hours to Czechoslovakia, 19 hours to Poland and Hungary, 12 hours to Rumania, and 8 hours to Bulgaria. RFE is registered in Germany as a foreign nonprofit corporation and is licensed by the German Government to operate transmitters. RARET, a Portuguese corporation established to represent Free Europe, Inc. in Portugal, controls the operations of shortwave transmitters located in that country to overcome jamming efforts by the Communist governments.

In its early years, RFE engaged primarily in psychological warfare; its broadcasts were polemical and politically oriented. By the mid-fifties this approach was drastically modified and the current emphasis is on factual news reporting and balanced commentaries. The basic objective is to provide encouragement to indigenous forces of peaceful reform and to increase public awareness of events taking place within the target countries and abroad and to promote accountability of public officials for their public actions.

To carry out its mission, RFE has developed a highly professional staff with specialized linguistic and research capabilities. Its news coverage is based on material provided by the principal Western wire services and about 1,600 publications, including 900 of Communist origin. In addition, RFE monitors a dozen Communist news agencies and 40 stations in the U.S.S.R., Eastern Europe and Communist China. The radio's research products, in the form of reports and analyses of Communist affairs, are subscribed to and are widely used by Western scholars, journalists, and government officials.

According to its most recent budget document, RFE maintains a total employee strength of 1,513, about 1,386 of whom reside in Germany and Portugal. Total expenditures for fiscal year 1973 are estimated at \$23,940,000. The administration's fiscal year 1974 request of \$31,604,000 does not provide for any expansion in personnel or operations, but is based primarily on cost increases necessitated by the devaluation of the dollar. Such increases are substantial since most of RFE's expenditures are made in German marks.

RFE's own surveys of East European listening habits indicate a total radio audience of more than 30 million people (i.e. one or more times per month). This represents 50 percent of the over 14 population in the five listening areas or countries. As noted in the Eisenhower Commission's report, RFE's opinion-sampling methods have been examined and endorsed by outside specialists, such as the Olivef Quayle Co. (October 1970) and by the Library of Congress' Congressional Research Service (March 1972).

#### RADIO LIBERTY (RL)

RL is incorporated as Radio Liberty Committee under the laws of the State of Delaware, with administrative headquarters in New York City. Broadcast headquarters and research facilities are located in

Munich. With 17 transmitters at sites in West Germany, Spain, and Taiwan, RL broadcasts 295 transmitter hours daily in Russian and up to 18 other languages spoken within the U.S.S.R.

Like RFE, RL has substantially modified its early cold war advocacy of "liberation" to its current goal of "liberalization". Its broadcasts no longer espouse the concept of revolt, but are designed to foster popular pressures for policies of moderation on the part of the Soviet official hierarchy. Explaining the workings of a democratic system in terms understandable to Soviet citizens is another program goal, but the primary mission of the radio is to disseminate news and commentary about internal developments *not* carried by the Soviet press or television facilities. Such news is culled from a variety of sources, including correspondents, the monitoring of regional radio broadcasts, and expert analysis of Soviet publications. "Cross-reporting" of events in other, more liberal Communist countries is another feature of RL's broadcasting program.

#### *Samizdat*

An important source of RL's current broadcasting material is the phenomenon known as "samizdat"—literally "self-publishing" in the form of typescript manuscripts circulated clandestinely by individuals attempting to avoid official censorship. Samizdat publications, ranging from novels by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn to open letters from Soviet Jews wishing to emigrate, are broadcast by Radio Liberty to widely dispersed areas within the Soviet Union. The thrust of these works is on reform, not revolution, and the tone is reported to be businesslike and restrained. Since samizdat writers are by no means always in agreement on points of view or on proposed solutions, RL serves essentially as an "echo chamber"—emphasizing that the opinions expressed do not necessarily represent those of the station.

In recent years, RL has devoted an increasing amount of its program time to the plight of Soviet Jews. Attention has been paid to the regime's discriminatory practices, and criticism of Soviet anti-Semitism by Western Communist parties has also received widespread coverage. Cultural programs, particularly during major Jewish holidays, have been featured, and selected messages in the Yiddish language have been specially transmitted on those occasions.

RL has 877 employees, 763 stationed abroad. Its budget for fiscal year 1974 is estimated at \$18,330,000. Expenditures during fiscal year 1973 are estimated at \$15,274,000. Again, the increase in the fiscal year 1974 authorization request stems almost entirely from dollar devaluation costs and does not encompass any expansion in personnel or operations.

The task of evaluating RL's effectiveness is more difficult than is the case with RFE. Soviet citizens travel abroad much less frequently than do other Eastern Europeans, and their movements are more likely to be watched by the Soviet authorities. For this reason, they are less amenable to interviews and the opinion sampling techniques employed by RFE. Until recently, the main evidence cited in support of the radio's impact within the U.S.S.R. has been in the form of "negative indicators," such as continuous jamming and attacks on RL's reporting by official Soviet media. A recent independent study has uncovered evidence of RL's listener appeal vis-a-vis Soviet domestic broadcasts, which is based almost entirely on polls con-

6

ducted by the Soviets themselves. A summary statement of these findings has been included in the hearings record and is available for reference purposes.

#### THE BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

The Eisenhower Commission recommended, and the proposed legislation provides for, the creation of a Presidentially appointed Board for International Broadcasting, which would receive congressionally appropriated funds and allocate them to RFE and RL. It would also carry out limited policy and oversight functions.

#### FUNCTIONS

Under section 4(a), the Board is authorized—

1. To make grants to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty;
2. To review and evaluate the mission and operation of the two radios and to assess the "quality, effectiveness and professional integrity" of their broadcasting within the context of broad U.S. foreign policy objectives;
3. To encourage the most effective utilization of available resources and undertake such studies as may be necessary to ensure economic and efficient operations;
4. To develop financial and auditing procedures to ensure that grants are being made for the purposes Congress intended;
5. To appoint staff personnel as may be necessary, subject to provisions of title 5, U.S.C. (governing appointments in the competitive service); to procure temporary and intermittent personnel services, and provide travel and per diem expenses for official business purposes;
6. To report annually to the President and to Congress on or before October 30 on activities of the Board during the year ending the preceding June 30 and to evaluate the operations of RFE and RL.

The bill also provides that RFE and RL shall maintain full and accurate records of receipts and expenditures and that the Comptroller General of the United States shall have full access to such records for purposes of audit.

#### COMPOSITION

The Board shall consist of five voting members—all appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—and two ex officio (nonvoting) members representing the two radios (i.e. the chief executive officers of RFE and RL, respectively). All voting members are to serve without annual salary, although they may be compensated on a daily basis at level V of the Executive schedule while attending Board meetings or engaged in official Board business and receive travel expenses and per diem. Initially, three voting members are to be appointed for a term of 3 years and two voting members for a term of 2 years. Therefore, all voting members are to serve 3-year terms.

#### SELECTION CRITERIA

Voting members appointed by the President shall be selected from "among Americans distinguished in the fields of foreign policy or mass communications" who are *not* regular full-time employees of the U.S. Government. Not more than three such members "shall be of the same political party".

#### PRIVATE SUPPORT

The Board is authorized to receive donations, bequests, gifts, and other contributions from private individuals and corporations and is to be classified as a nonprofit corporation under relevant provisions of the IRS code. The committee approved an amendment adopted by the Senate which requires all such donations to be a matter of public record.

#### COMMITTEE REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES

The Board's proposed role and prescribed functions were the subject of close examination by members of the committee in the course of the hearings. Although the bill, as reported, provides for the creation of this mechanism, some doubts remain whether a five-member, non-salaried Board, assisted by a small staff, will be equipped to carry out meaningful oversight functions as envisioned by section 4(a) of the bill. The committee intends to watch carefully the performance of the Board during the coming year, particularly its success in carrying out the recommendations of the Eisenhower Commission that it—

Undertake as one of its first tasks an intensive examination of the relative benefits that might accrue from possible consolidation of headquarters space and functions in Munich as well as other locations where the two stations have personnel and facilities; and that the Board, as a matter of high priority, work closely with the stations in exploring new possibilities for economy and efficiency and in carrying out studies and reorganizations designed to achieve savings and increased efficiency of operations.

In addition, the committee hopes that the Board will address itself to another recommendation of the Eisenhower Commission—"that a comprehensive study of all United States international radio broadcasting facilities be undertaken at the earliest possible date"—and report upon it prior to consideration by Congress of any further authorizations.

The committee wishes to make clear its intention that the Board shall encourage continuation of the professional integrity and independence of the two radio stations, their chief operating executives, and their staffs. This aspect of the Board's mandate will also be reviewed by the committee during the coming year.

#### BALTIC LANGUAGE BROADCASTS

Administration policy on the question of initiation by Radio Liberty of broadcasts in the Baltic languages (Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian) was also the focus of the committee's attention during

the hearings. Administration witnesses noted that Radio Liberty had planned to commence such broadcasts in fiscal year 1974 and that the Department of State had approved this plan. However, owing to severe budgetary stringencies, the \$270,000 originally proposed for this project and other new project funds for RL were eliminated from the fiscal year 1974 budget by OMB.

In a letter to Chairman Morgan, dated August 2, 1973, Assistant Secretary of State Marshall Wright commented as follows:

Let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of State continues to support Radio Liberty's intention to begin broadcasts to the Baltic peoples in their native languages as soon as practicable. We believe that passage by the Congress this year of the proposed authorizing and appropriation legislation would provide the essential base of security and stability for Radio Liberty to reopen the question of such broadcast operations in its fiscal year 1975 budget presentation.

It is the committee's view that Baltic language broadcasts should be accorded a high priority and be included in the fiscal year 1975 budget presentation to the Congress. Planning for this contingency should begin promptly.

#### INTERNATIONAL RADIO BROADCASTING ACTIVITIES

##### *Fiscal year 1974 budget request*

(In thousands of dollars)

President's budget:	
Radio Free Europe .....	28,370
Radio Liberty .....	16,270
Total .....	<u>44,640</u>
Budget amendment (H. Doc. 93-104):	
Increased costs resulting from the devaluation of February 12, 1973:	
Radio Free Europe .....	3,234
Radio Liberty .....	2,060
Total .....	<u>5,294</u>
Total fiscal year 1974 budget request:	
Radio Free Europe .....	31,604
Radio Liberty .....	18,330
Total .....	<u>49,934</u>
Proposed budget amendment for the costs of the Board for International Broadcasting .....	275
Estimated total fiscal year 1974 budget requirements .....	<u>50,209</u>



OPPOSING VIEWS OF HONORABLE WAYNE L. HAYS

It is my view that the American taxpayers should not pay for organizations which are under the direction of and staffed by more than 99 percent non-American citizens. For that reason, and the fact that no one knows whether anyone listens to these stations, I can no longer support the expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars for these functions.

WAYNE L. HAYS.

(9)

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL  
TWENTY QUESTIONS ABOUT RADIO FREE EUROPE AND  
RADIO LIBERTY

This bill provides an approach without parallel in the domestic or foreign operations of the United States government. Neither the report of the Eisenhower Commission nor the Committee hearings provide answers to the serious questions which this approach raises. Some of these questions, the answers to which Members should have before they support this bill or any similar legislation, are:

1. Who in this world will believe that these radio stations operate in any way "like a free press" . . . with "professional independence" (as the Eisenhower Commission maintains in its report) when they are financed principally and directly by the U.S. Government?

2. Why should the American taxpayer supply \$50 million or more annually for the foreseeable future for two private organizations which are run principally by non-Americans operating in foreign countries to send *their* views into other foreign countries?

3. Do the American people believe they have such a monopoly on wisdom and virtue in the world community that they should finance "truth" broadcasts on the internal problems of Eastern European countries?

4. Would the Congress grant \$50 million to any other board to be channeled to private groups with no guidelines for spending the money, no effective oversight procedure and no description of the public goals to be gained through this public expenditure?

5. What officials, responsible to our government and with proper resources for the task, will supervise the expenditure of these public funds which will be spent in foreign countries for activities directed into other foreign countries?

6. Should the official foreign policy agencies of our government, especially the Department of State, be excluded from an advisory or supervisory role over these stations which broadcast controversial information on the internal affairs of our principal foreign adversary?

7. Would we believe the Soviet Union if it said that *its* financing of "private" radio stations beamed to the United States about American domestic affairs was compatible with detente?

8. If the Soviet Union financed the broadcast into the United States of the views of deserters and draft resisters would we accept the Soviet explanation that they sought only to impart information and not to interfere with our domestic affairs?

9. Should the Congress continue to finance both official overseas radio broadcasts of the Voice of America and "unofficial" broadcasts of these stations with a duplication of function, facilities and personnel?

10. Can Congress convince itself, and its constituents, that \$56 million in public funds for the Voice of America constitutes "official"

international broadcasting while another \$50 million in public funds for these two stations constitutes "free and independent" broadcasting?

11. If these stations are performing such important functions why do West European governments refuse to contribute to their operation?

12. Why do private contributors in either Europe or the United States fail to provide more than token financial support for these stations?

13. If broadcasting "internal" news to Eastern European countries is important enough to negate or at least diminish the trend toward detente, why do none of our West European allies undertake such broadcasting on their international stations? Why is the United States the only Western country involved in such broadcasting?

14. If it is proper today for one government to finance the broadcast of views of emigrés to their country of origin, why did we use secret CIA funds to finance the stations for nearly 20 years?

15. If Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are proper functions for official U.S. government financing, why not establish a Radio Free China, Radio Free Greece, or Radio Free Brazil? If we are truly concerned about the lack of information within other countries, should we not try to do a thorough job in every country where such deficiencies in news exist?

16. Why should the United States increase its balance-of-payments deficits (and help Europeans increase their surpluses) by sending another \$50 million overseas each year, principally to West Germany where the dollar has already declined by about 30% in value since January 1973?

17. Why should U.S. public funds pay the salaries of over 2400 workers, largely non-Americans, living overseas at an average salary of over \$10,000 each, when we have a sizeable unemployment problem at home?

18. Why should Congress authorize these millions of dollars to support anti-government broadcasts to the Soviet Union in a year following one in which we sold one-quarter of our grain crop to that government at bargain prices?

19. Does anyone have any reliable information about whether these stations are worthwhile operations, in proportion to their costs, except as they benefit several thousand expatriates who run them?

20. Would anyone today consider establishing Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty if they did not already exist?

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.

MINORITY VIEWS OF HONORABLE MICHAEL  
HARRINGTON

I am unable to support H.R. 8144 to authorize an appropriation of \$50 million to provide for a Board for International Broadcasting to supervise the activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The structure of the bill is imperfect; but more importantly, the idea itself is flawed.

The forces arrayed on the side of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are impressive, and they claim to carry the banner of truth. It is not easy to sort out facts from rhetoric, but it is my belief from the facts that the two Radios serve no purpose but to exacerbate tension between East and West, a singularly unfitting activity for support by the United States Congress.

Proponents maintain that, under the proposed International Board of Broadcasting, the Radios will be independent of the U.S. government and, therefore, free to broadcast truths which the Voice of America, an official government organ, must suppress. This is nonsense; broadcasting funded by a government cannot be independent of that government, despite the best intentions of its operators. Is there any positive purpose in broadcasting to the East yet another laundered version of events?

The underlying intent of the Radios' broadcasts is faulty. It is a belief born of national chauvinism that we alone possess the truth (as we perceive it) and that it is part of the responsibility of this government to broadcast it to the enslaved peoples of the world. While this may be inspirational, it is scarcely good politics of the sort that is suited to the post-cold-war world. We have stated that we will deal with nations as they are, and then we persist in highlighting our disapproval of and opposition to them. It is not the business of this nation to intervene in the relationship of another government with its people.

The continued existence and proposed expansion of Radio Free Europe runs counter to U.S. policy as articulated many times by this Administration. The President maintains that we will continue to move toward a reduction of tension with the East. This policy is not well served, but contradicted, by the Radios, who by their very nature and history, represent combativeness toward the regimes of the Eastern bloc. Founded and long operated under CIA control, the Radios at the height of the cold war were used to encourage dissidents. If we are now to accept the Soviet Union and its allies as we find them, without attempting to make them over in our image, we must stop broadcasts which began for the stated purpose of encouraging "liberation" in the East. It is hardly the time for a war of liberation to be led by the United States. It is time instead to recognize these societies for what they are. It is time to deal with them and with their governments honestly. Government-funded and sponsored attempts to encourage dissatisfaction in other countries are inappropriate when our stated intention is to reduce tensions.

There is much sympathy for the dissidents within the Eastern bloc who are persecuted and harassed by government authorities. I share this sympathy, and do not approve of governmental moves to crush opposition. However, I do not regard the Radios as effective means for instituting a different political climate in the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe. On the contrary, they provide an excuse for those in the governments who wish to maintain a hard line toward dissent. These governments can point to the Radios as evidence that the cold war is not ending, that intervention by the West is continuing, and that, therefore, internal controls are still necessary in the face of this outside threat. The Radios indeed serve to keep the voice of dissidence alive—they guarantee that it will never be heard within Soviet society proper, because dissidence is married by association to the West.

Nothing is to be gained from the exacerbation of tension that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty cause. I cannot support legislation to continue this activity another year. We are far more likely to achieve some good for the people of the world by lowering international tensions than by continuing broadcasts in a conspiratorial vein which persist in intruding our version of truth into another society.

MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON.

#### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HONORABLE J. HERBERT BURKE

Times change. World conditions change, and the need for certain programs changes. The so-called "freedom radios" began in the early 1950's during a period of ideological confrontation between the East and West. Radio Liberty focused upon the Soviet Union, Radio Free Europe upon the Eastern European satellites. Each presented itself as a spontaneous creation, run by freedom-loving refugees and financed by dimes and nickels from school children. Both in reality were organizational and functional instruments of the CIA.

Today, the ideological confrontation has waned and the balance of power has stabilized; however, in fiscal year 1973 we spent more than \$138 million of U.S. taxpayers' money on overseas broadcasting activities through Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty and Armed Forces Radio and Television Service.

For fiscal year 1974, \$67 million has been requested for Voice of America, \$50 million for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and almost \$32 million for American Forces Radio and Television Service bringing the total request for overseas broadcasting activities to \$149 million.

It may be true that citizens of the Soviet Union and the Eastern European Countries have a "right to know," but why is it the duty of the American taxpayer alone to transmit the truth to them? In addition, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe are not the only international radios broadcasting into the Communist controlled countries of Europe.

The United States finances two other organizations whose broadcasts reach the Soviet Union and the Communist countries in Europe—the Voice of America and the Armed Forces Radio and Television Service. In addition, the British Broadcasting Corporation, the West German station, Deutsche Welle, the official radio of France, the Vatican, Israel and others transmit a sum total of 822 program-hours each week to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe over and above the efforts of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Thus it would seem fair to conclude that to a great extent Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty duplicate news programs of the other stations presently beaming programs into the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. With or without the so-called "freedom radios" a full and accurate flow of information is available to listeners in Communist countries.

The Voice of America as the radio arm of the United States Information Service transmits information about the United States aimed at foreign audiences.

The Armed Forces Radio and Television Service transmits international, national, government, military and sports news from major U.S. commercial networks, wire services, and military correspondents to U.S. military personnel and their dependents living abroad.

The public is aware that Voice of America transmits information to foreign audiences in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, but, few taxpayers are aware that Armed Forces Radio and Television Service does the same.

AFN-Frankfurt, has a 150,000 watt transmitter, three times the maximum authorized in the U.S. AFRTS has a 50,000 watt transmitter in Munich, a 14,000 watt transmitter in Augsburg, 10,000 watt transmitters at Berlin, Kaiserlautern, Nuremberg, Stuttgart, and Grafenwoehr, and a 5000 watt transmitter at Bremerhaven. In all there are 47 American Forces Network stations in Europe. However, this is only part of the system. The total broadcasting system has 376 radio stations and 103 television stations. These broadcasts should be taken into account for like the Voice of America and the "freedom radios" the vast AFRTS network contributes considerably to the worldwide availability of information about the U.S. and about international events.

The argument that we need some voice is perhaps proper, but to have three voices is excessive and it is wasteful, particularly in view of the economic situation of the U.S. with regard to its balance of payments.

If these radios are to continue, they should be financed at least in part by the prosperous nations of Western Europe which stand to benefit more than anyone else if the radios are successful in accomplishing their broadcasting objectives.

Why should not West European governments and private European sources help pay the cost of the two radios and their research efforts? The latter alone costs approximately \$3.9 million annually. If West European governments cannot contribute directly, they ought to expand such "intangible" contributions as they may now be making.

Under the terms of the bill being reported from this committee it is impossible to guarantee the taxpayer that the authorization will be only \$50,209,000 for fiscal year 1974 because there is an open-ended authorization that authorizes such supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, etc.

Until such time as the West European countries reach into their own pockets to help pay the cost of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, I cannot support passage of this legislation.

J. HERBERT BURKE.

( )